UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/637,184	08/08/2003	Daryl Carvis Cromer	RPS920020126US1	3939

53493 7590 10/19/2007	**EXAMINER**
LENOVO (US) IP Law	DEBNATH, SUMAN
1009 Think Place	
Building One, 4th Floor 4B6	
Morrisville, NC 27560	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/637,184	CROMER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Suman Debnath	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 August 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-35 are pending in this application.

2.   Claims 1, 5, 8, 13, 20, 25 and 32 are presently amended.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can
be found in a prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   Claims 1-4, 13-16 and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Watts (Patent No.: US 6,327,623 B2) in view of Guzman et al.
(Patent No.: US 7,058,847 B1), hereinafter "Guzman".

5.   As to claim 1, Watts a program product comprising: a computer useable medium
having computer readable program code stored therein, the computer readable program
code in said program product being effective (abstract) when executing to: accept
personality selection input provided by a user to the computer (column 9, lines 30-35)
which has a storage device adapted to store various data files (column 16, lines 37-50)
and to assume a selected personality in the computer based on the provided input,
wherein the personality selection input is not provided in response to a prompt provided
in response to determining that a location of the computer has changed (column 9, lines
30-35 and lines 54-65, which describes user explicitly selects an environment (i.e.
office) which would indicate environment as claimed by the applicant "assume a
selected personality selection input in the computer based on provided input." In this

case, Watts teaches that user made the selection and that selection was not made

based on any response to a prompt provided in response to determining that a location

of the computer has changed. Furthermore, Applicant should note that assuming a

selected personality (i.e. location) either automatically without user's

confirmation/authorization or by having an user verifying/confirming prior to making the

changes to the computer is just a matter of design choice and any one with ordinary skill

in the art at the time of the invention was made would understand and would implement

as would required by a system depending upon how much flexibility required by user);

files to be stored in the storage device according to the selected personality ("…..set at

the directory holding the files located on the selected workspace", e.g., see column 16,

lines 37-50);

Watts doesn't' explicitly disclose tag files to be stored and implement a filter

which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality to an application

executing within the computer and removes the tags applied by the code which is

effective to tag files and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to the selected

personality from being passed to the application executing within the computer.

However, Guzman discloses tag files to be stored (column 11, lines 60-67 -

column 12, lines 1-10) and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to

the selected personality and removes the tags applied by the code which is effective to

tag files ("…restoration engine 404 remove character fields and renames the restoration

file .." - e.g., column 13, lines 5-15) and which (b) blocks files not tagged according to

the selected personality from being passed to the application executing within the

computer (column 11, lines 60-67 to column 12, lines 1-10, Guzman teaching this

concept by appending a filename designation with an associated unique identifier and

as described by Guzman this identifier can be used in the computer system for later use

for restoration processing which would let the user access the appropriate file (i.e. files

with associated unique identifier). Applicant should note that if the files can be viewed

remotely according to the network element with which file data is associated then this

implementation can be done only within a computer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by tagging files to be

stored and by implementing a filter to remove the tag and to block files not tagged as

taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a

secure manner.

6.   As to claims 13 and 25, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the

rejection of claim 1.

7.   As to claims 2, 14 and 26, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality

selection input is independent of user login identity information (column 8, lines 45-65,

column 10, lines 40-65 and column 16, lines 35-50, Watts teaches of accepting

personality selection input that is independent of user login identity information by

having a viewable workspace when detects changes).

8.   As to claims 3,15 and 27, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality

selection input accepts the input as a function of user login identity information (column

9, lines 30-55).

9.   As to claims 4, 16 and 28, Watts doesn't explicitly disclose wherein tagging files

appends characters to the data file name. However, Guzman discloses wherein tagging

files appends characters to the data file name (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines

1-10).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by including tagging files

appends characters to the data file name as taught by Guzman in order to access a file

system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

10.   Claims 5-12, 17-24 and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Watts in view of Guzman and further in view of Kataoka et al. (Patent

Number: 5,857,021), hereinafter "Kataoka".

11.   As to claim 5, Watts discloses a program product comprising: a computer

useable medium having computer readable program code stored therein, the computer

readable program code in said program product being effective (abstract) when

executing to: accept and authenticate input provided by a user selected from a plurality

of personality selection inputs to a computer (column 9, lines 30-35) which has a

storage device adapted to store various data files (column 16, lines 37-50) and assume

a selected personality in the computer based on the provided input, wherein the

personality selection input is not provided in response to a prompt provided in response

to determining that a location of the computer has changed (column 9, lines 30-35 and

lines 54-65, which describes user explicitly selects an environment (i.e. office) which

would indicate environment as claimed by the applicant "assume a selected personality

selection input in the computer based on provided input." In this case, Watts teaches

that user made the selection and that selection was not made based on any response to

a prompt provided in response to determining that a location of the computer has

changed. Furthermore, Applicant should note that assuming a selected personality (i.e.

location) either automatically without user's confirmation/authorization or by having an

user verifying/confirming prior to making the changes to the computer is just a matter of

design choice and any one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was

made would understand and would implement as would required by a system

depending upon how much flexibility required by user); files to be stored in the storage

device according to the selected personality wherein the contents of the files are stored

on the storage device (".....set at the directory holding the files located on the selected

workspace", e.g., see column 16, lines 37-50); wherein, when at least one application is

executed in the computer, a change in the selected personality based on newly

provided input does not require termination of the at least one application (column 9,

lines 30-35 and lines 54-65, column 10, lines 40-60, Applicant should note that the claim

limitation is given the broadest reasonable interpretation during the examination.

Someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would

understand that Watts teaches selected personality does not require termination of the

at least one application by having the operating system running when changing the

location).

Watts doesn't explicitly disclose tag files to be stored in an encrypted format and

implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged according to the selected personality to

an application executing within the computer and removes the tags applied by the code

which is effective to tag files and decrypts the contents of tagged files which have been

stored in an encrypted format on the storage device and which (b) blocks files not

tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the application

executing within the computer.

However, Guzman discloses tag files to be stored (column 11, lines 60-67 to

column 12, lines 1-10) and implement a filter which (a) passes files tagged from being

passed to the application executing within the computer and removes the tags applied

by the code which is effective to tag files ("...restoration engine 404 remove character

fields and renames the restoration file .." - e.g., column 13, lines 5-15) and which (b)

blocks files not tagged according to the selected personality from being passed to the

application executing within the computer (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-

10, Guzman teaching this concept by appending a filename designation with an

associated unique identifier and as described by Guzman this identifier can be used in

the computer system for later use for restoration processing which would let the user

access the appropriate file (i.e. files with associated unique identifier). Applicant should

note that if the files can be viewed remotely according to the network element with which file data is associated then this implementation can be done only within a computer).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by tagging files to be stored and by implementing a filter to remove the tag and to block files not tagged as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

Neither Watts nor Guzman explicitly disclose storing file in an encrypted format and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device. However, Kataoka discloses storing file in an encrypted format (abstract, FIG. 6) and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device (abstract, FIG. 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts and Guzman by storing file in an encrypted format and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format on the storage device as taught by Kataoka in order to provide "a reliable security systems to protect information in storage media from unauthorized access" (Kataoka).

12.   As to claims 17 and 29, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 5.

13.   As to claims 6, 18 and 30, Watts discloses selected personality (column 10, lines

30-60). Watts doesn't explicitly disclose implementing the filter further passes files

tagged as universal irrespective of the selected personality and thereby overrides the

filter action (b) which otherwise blocks files not tagged according to the selected

Personality. However, Guzman discloses implementing the filter further passes files

tagged as universal irrespective of the selected personality and thereby overrides the

filter action ("...restoration engine 404 remove character fields and renames the

restoration file ...." - e.g., column 13, lines 5-15) (b) which otherwise blocks files not

tagged according to a selected personality (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-

10, Guzman teaching of blocking file not tagged by associating a specific unique

identifier with the file name).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by implementing the

filter which further passes files tagged as universal irrespective of the selected

personality and thereby overrides the filter action (b) which otherwise blocks files not

tagged according to the selected personality as taught by Guzman in order to access a

file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

14.   As to claims 7, 19 and 31, these are rejected using the same rationale as for the

rejection of claim 6.

15.   As to claims 8, 20 and 32, Watts discloses wherein a call to selected

authentications, of the input provided by a user selected from a plurality of personality

selection inputs, performed by accepting and authenticates (column 9, lines 35-65 and

column 10, lines 30-55). Watts doesn't explicitly disclose call to a cryptographic

processor that the encryption performed by the code that implements the filter, and the

decryption performed the code that implements the filter. However, Guzman discloses

implementing a filter (column 11, lines 60-67 to column 12, lines 1-10 and column 13,

lines 5-15).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by implementing a filter

as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in

a secure manner.

Neither Watts nor Guzman explicitly disclose calling a cryptographic processor,

which determines the encryption and decryption performed. However, Kataoka

discloses calling a cryptographic processor, which determines the encryption and

decryption performed (abstract, FIG. 6 and FIG. 7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts and Guzman by storing file

in an encrypted format and decrypting file that have been stored in an encrypted format

on the storage device as taught by Kataoka in order to provide "a reliable security

systems to protect information in storage media from unauthorized access" (Kataoka).

16.   As to claims 9, 21 and 33, neither Watts nor Guzman discloses wherein the

cryptographic processor called is a trusted platform module. However, Kataoka

discloses wherein the cryptographic processor called is a trusted platform module (FIG.

6 and FIG. 7, Kataoka discloses trusted platform module by validating identification

before encrypting or decrypting any data).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts and Guzman by including

wherein the cryptographic processor called is a trusted platform module as taught by

Kataoka in order to provide "a reliable security systems to protect information in storage

media from unauthorized access" (Kataoka).

17.   As to claim 10, 22 and 34, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality

selection input is independent of user login identity information (column 8, lines 45-65,

column 10, lines 40-65 and column 16, lines 35-50, Watts teaches of accepting

personality selection input that is independent of user login identity information by

having a viewable workspace when detects changes).

18.   As to claim 11, 23 and 35, Watts discloses wherein accepting personality

selection input accepts the input as a function of user login identity information (column

10-65, "...if the user accepts the changes, the configuration is changed..").

19.   As to claim 12 and 24, Watts doesn't explicitly disclose wherein tagging files that appends characters to the data file name. However, Guzman discloses wherein tagging files that appends characters to the data file name (column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Watts by including wherein tagging files that appends characters to the data file name as taught by Guzman in order to access a file system related to a specific workspace in a secure manner.

Response to Arguments

20.   Applicant's argument filed 02 August 2007 have been fully considered are are not persuasive.

21.   Applicant argues that: "neither *Watts* nor *Guzman,* taken separately or in combination, describe the requirement of claim 1, as amended herein, or the personality selection input to not be provided in response to a prompt provided in response to determining that a location of the computer has changed. Instead, in column 10, lines 34-39 and 55-60, *Watts* describes prompting the user, in response to determining that the location has changed, to provide an indication of whether he wants the system configuration to be changed to one associated with the new location. Thus, *Watts* merely uses this input from the user to provide an opportunity to override the determination of a new location for the computer".

Examiner maintains that: Watts teaches a selected personality in the computer

based on the provided input, wherein the personality selection input is not provided in

response to a prompt provided in response to determining that a location of the

computer has changed (column 9, lines 30-35 and lines 54-65, which describes user

explicitly selects an environment (i.e. office) which would indicate environment as

claimed by the applicant "assume a selected personality selection input in the computer

based on provided input." In this case, Watts teaches that user made the selection and

that selection was not made based on any response to a prompt provided in response

to determining that a location of the computer has changed. Furthermore, Applicant

should note that assuming a selected personality (i.e. location) either automatically

without user's confirmation/authorization or by having an user verifying/confirming prior

to making the changes to the computer is just a matter of design choice and any one

with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would understand and

would implement as would required by a system depending upon how much flexibility

required by user).

22.   Applicant argues that: "*Guzman* does not describe the use of personality

information inputs, with the tagging applied by *Guzman* being applied according to the

network element with which file data is associated."

Examiner maintains that: Guzman teaching this concept by appending a filename

designation with an associated unique identifier and as described by Guzman this

identifier can be used in the computer system for later use for restoration processing

which would let the user access the appropriate file (i.e. files with associated unique identifier). Applicant should note that if the files can be viewed remotely according to the network element with which file data is associated then this implementation can be done only within a computer. –e.g. column 11, lines 60-67 - column 12, lines 1-10.

23.   Applicant argues that: Watts, "Guzman, and Kataoka, taken singly or in combination, do not teach or describe the requirement of these claims for, when at least one application is executed in the computer, a change in the selected personality based on a change in the selected personality does not require termination of the at least one application. There is no indication of this type of operation in any of the cited references."

Examiner maintains that: Applicant should note that the claim limitation is given the broadest reasonable interpretation during the examination. Someone with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would understand that Watts teaches selected personality does not require termination of the at least one application by having the operating system running when changing the location. –e.g. column 9, lines 30-35 and lines 54-65.

24.   Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the

responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part

of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art

or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

25.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Suman Debnath whose telephone number is 571 270

1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SD

SUPERVIS'   AMINER
TECH.......... .... .EH 2100